REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18 and 20-23 are currently pending.
- Claims 2, 7, 19, 24 and 25 are previously canceled.
- Claims 6, 8-15, 16 and 21-23 are amended herein.

Support for the amendments to claims 6 and 16 is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at pages 19-20. Claims 8-15 and 21-23 are amended to address minor informalities. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

Allowed Claims

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 3-5 and 26 are allowable. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1, 3-5 and 26. Claim 1 is amended to address a minor informality. Claims 3-5 and 26 have not been amended. Therefore, claims 1, 3-5 and 26 remain in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 8-15 and 21-23 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

Claims 6, 8-15 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims

6, 8-15 and 21-23 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the § 101 rejection moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21, with the amendment herein, recites statutory subject matter under § 101 at least because the claim is amended to recite computer-readable "recording" medium. Therefore, the claimed computer-readable "recording" medium cannot embody a transitory signal, since a transitory signal is not a "recording" medium. Consequently, claim 21 (and its dependents) is limited to tangible embodiments. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claim 21 (and its dependents) are allowable.

Claim 6 is amended herein in view of the structure of claim 21. As such, the claimed computer-executable services and computer-readable information are stored on the computer-readable "recording" medium. Therefore, the claimed computer-readable "recording" medium cannot embody a transitory signal, since a transitory signal is not a "recording" medium. Consequently, claim 6 (and its dependents) is limited to tangible embodiments.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks that the Office withdraw this rejection.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Zintel:** Zintel et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029256
- **Saint:** Saint-Hilaire et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0101294
- **Fedotov:** Fedotov et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181796

Claims 6, 8-18 and 20 are Non-Obvious Over Zintel in view of Saint and further in view of Fedotov

Claims 6, 8-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Zintel in view of Saint and further in view of Fedotov. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6, as amended herein, recites, in part:

> a unilateral contract for describing one or more behaviors of the display service and specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control ....

Zintel describes the following, shown here for convenience (emphasis added):

> [0533] **UPnP provides a common set of interfaces for accessing devices and services, enabling the operational unification of diverse media types**. Communications protocols for Universal Plug and Play are based on industry standards, especially key Internet standards such as TCP/IP, HTML, XML, HTTP, DNS, LDAP, and others. Individual implementations for particular networks and buses are built on established protocols. ([0533])

However, Zintel does not teach or suggest "a unilateral contract for ... specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control," as recited in this claim, as amended. Rather, Zintel describes that "UPnP provides a common set of interfaces for accessing devices and services, enabling the operational unification of diverse media types." ([0533]) Zintel is silent

regarding the currently claimed "unilateral contract for ... specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control."

Saint does not remedy the deficiencies of Zintel because Saint does not teach or suggest the currently claimed "unilateral contract for ... specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control." Rather, Saint describes the following, shown here for convenience (emphasis added):

> [0113] Lightweight Remote Display Service ([0113])
>
> [0114] **In accordance with one aspect of the invention, a protocol is provided that enables an extended PC to display content on a remote device using a "push" model, wherein the extended PC pushes data and control information to the remote device using a predefined set of commands**, and the data is formatted to meet display capabilities advertised by the remote device via the discovery mechanism discussed above. The service provides a simple TCP connection port on which the extended PC sends a stream of "display this picture at position X, Y" type commands. ([0114])
>
> ...
>
> [0116] Reset (Int Protocol Version) ([0116])
>
> ...
>
> [0118] Flush (Int TimeSinceLastSync) ([0118])
>
> ...
>
> [0121] FlushFailed() ([0121])
>
> ...
>
> [0123] DrawFillBox (xl, yl, x2, y2, Color) ([0123])
>
> ...
>
> [0125] DrawImage (x, y, image) ([0125])

...

[0127] Allocate(Area Name, x, y, width, height) ([0127])

...

[0129] Repaint ( ) ([0129])

...

[0131] Move(xl, yl, x2, y2, Width, Height) ([0131])

In contrast to Applicant's claim 6, Saint describes a "Lightweight Remote Display Service ... that enables an extended PC to display content on a remote device using a 'push' model [that includes commands such as] Reset ... Flush ... FlushFailed ... DrawFillBox ... DrawImage ... Allocate ... Repaint ... [and] Move" ([0113], [0114], [0116], [0118], [0121], [0123], [0125], [0127], [0129] and [0131]). Saint is silent regarding the currently claimed "unilateral contract for ... specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control," at least because Saint does not describe these currently claimed features as part of the Lightweight Remote Display Service.

Fedotov does not remedy the deficiencies of the combination of Zintel and Saint because Fedotov also does not teach or suggest the currently claimed "unilateral contract for ... specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control." Rather, Fedotov describes the following, shown here for convenience (emphasis added):

> [0106] Illustratively, **a collaboration roster or a separate verification module may be consulted to verify that the received approval value matches the client's current approval value**. Illustratively, components of an organizer can access a collaboration roster without using the control unit interface that clients must use. Thus,

when a client object needs to verify a client permission, it can query the collaboration roster directly.

Fedotov does not teach or suggest the currently claimed "unilateral contract for describing one or more behaviors of the display service and specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control." In contrast, Fedotov describes that "a collaboration roster or a separate verification module may be **consulted** to verify that the received approval value matches the client's current approval value ... [and] **when a client object needs to verify a client permission, it can query the collaboration roster directly**." ([0106], emphasis added.)

Fedotov does not describe that the collaboration roster or the separate verification module is for the currently claimed "describing one or more behaviors of the display service and specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control." Thus, Fedotov is silent regarding the currently claimed features of the "unilateral contract."

Consequently, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest the currently claimed "unilateral contract for describing one or more behaviors of the display service and specifying regulation of the display service by specifying attaching behavioral conditions to files to govern access control." Thus, this claim is allowable over the combination of the cited references on at least this basis.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 6.

Dependent Claims 8-15

Claims 8-15 ultimately depend from independent claim 6. As discussed above, claim 6 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 8-15 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 8-15.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, recites, in part:

> receiving a customizable tag-based document that describes a shape of a cursor, the customizable tag-based document including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask specifying pixels that comprise the cursor and offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor;
>
> requesting the service to change a cursor shape, the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor based at least in part on the customizable tag-based document;....

The Office indicates the following regarding the rejection of independent claim 6 (Office Action, p. 6):

> Zintel does not specifically teach a cursor shape service with a port identifiable by an identifier, a customizable tag-based document that describes the shape of an on-screen cursor, the customizable tag-based

document including image data specifying pixels that comprise the on-screen cursor.

Zintel does not teach or suggest "a customizable tag-based document that describes a shape of a cursor, the customizable tag-based document including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask specifying pixels that comprise the cursor and offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor," as recited in claim 16, as amended. Zintel is silent regarding these claimed features.

Saint describes the following, shown here for convenience (emphasis added):

> [0109] The UPnP description for a device contains several pieces of vendor-specific information, definitions of all embedded devices, URL for presentation of the device, and listings for all services, including URLs for control and eventing. In addition to defining non-standard devices, UPnP vendors may add embedded devices and services to standard devices. To illustrate these, **below is a listing with placeholders in italics for actual elements and values corresponding to a device description**.
>
> ...
>
> <icon>
>
> <mimetype>image/format</mimetype>
>
> **<width>horizontal pixels</width>**
>
> **<height>vertical pixels</height>**
>
> <depth>color depth</depth>
>
> <url>URL to icon</url>
>
> </icon> ([0109])

However, Saint does not remedy the deficiencies of Zintel because Saint does not teach or suggest "a customizable tag-based document that describes a shape of a cursor, the customizable tag-based document including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask specifying pixels that comprise the cursor and offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor," as recited in claim 16, as amended. Rather, as shown above, Saint describes a "UPnP description [containing a] mimetype image/format," such as pixel width and height. ([0109].) Saint is silent regarding a UPnP description "including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask specifying pixels that comprise the cursor and offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor," as recited in this claim, as amended.

Fedotov describes the following, shown here for convenience:

> [0157] A "cursor" object primitive may be the cursor of a mouse (or other pointing device), of virtually any shape. By defining a presenter's cursor as an object primitive, the cursor can be correctly and easily placed by caching the cursor object and simply specifying the position at which to draw the object. **To fully define a cursor object, its image data (e.g., shape, color), its size and its hotspot coordinate (i.e., location) are noted**. The hotspot coordinate may be used to track the cursor as it moves. ([0157])
>
> [0158] An "image" object primitive may comprise any graphical content **that isn't a "**character,**" "cursor"** or other already defined object. An image primitive may be encoded in virtually any manner (e.g., according to any coding scheme) for dissemination to attendees. ([0158])
>
> ...

[0192] In different embodiments of the invention, different methods may be used to find or identify or **define a region of the presenter's desktop. For example, a region may be defined with a bitmap**. Thus, **a region within a sixteen pixel by sixteen pixel square area could be defined by a bitmap** 256 bits in size (i.e., one bit for each pixel). Illustratively, a pixel is given one value (e.g., zero) if the pixel is not part of the region being defined, and a different value (e.g., one), if it is part of the region. Thus, **a bitmap may be used to define or identify the pattern of a character within a cluster or other area**. As described above, an action primitive may specify an action to take with regard to that region (e.g., fill it with a color). ([0192])

...

[0196] A region containing character object primitives may be defined as just the shapes of the characters. That is, the region may comprise just vectors or pixels defining the characters. That region may be defined in any suitable manner (e.g., scanlines, bitmap) in an object primitive, and be followed by an action primitive indicating which color(s) to use to fill the character regions. ([0196])

[0197] An image object may be defined by bitmap, scanline, or virtually any other method. An image update primitive for reproducing the image primitive may include a value for each pixel in the image, wherein the value is the index in the palette of the color of the pixel. ([0197])

However, Fedotov does not remedy the deficiencies of the combination of Zintel and Saint because Fedotov does not teach or suggest object or action primatives "including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask for specifying pixels that comprise the cursor," as recited in claim 16, as amended.

Rather, as shown above, Fedotov describes that region, image and character object primitives can be defined with a bitmap. (see [0192], [0196] and [0197] shown above.) However, Fedotov does not explicitly describe that a cursor object primitive can be defined with a bitmap. Fedotov also does not explicitly describe using the currently claimed "bitmap mask." In contrast, Fedotov describes that "[a]n 'image' object primitive may comprise any graphical content that **isn't a** 'character,' '**cursor**' or other already defined object." ([0158], emphasis added) Fedotov further describes that "[t]o fully define a cursor object, its image data (e.g., shape, color), its size and its hotspot coordinate (i.e., location) are noted." ([0157].) Fedotov is silent regarding a cursor object "comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask for specifying pixels that comprise the cursor," as currently claimed.

Additionally, Fedotov does not teach or suggest an object or action primitive that includes the currently claimed "offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor." Instead, Fedotov merely describes that "[t]o fully define a cursor object, its image data (e.g., shape, color), its size and its hotspot coordinate (i.e., location) are noted. The hotspot coordinate may be used to track the cursor as it moves." ([0157].) The "hotspot coordinate" described by Fedotov is not analogous to the currently claimed "offset data," because the "hotspot coordinate" is the location pointed to by the cursor and not the currently claimed "offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor."

Consequently, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest the currently claimed "customizable tag-based document including image data comprising a bitmap image and a bitmap mask for specifying pixels that comprise the

cursor and offset data specifying an offset between the pixels and a location pointed to by the cursor." Thus, this claim is allowable over the combination of the cited references on at least this basis.

As another example, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest "requesting the service to change a cursor shape, the act of requesting invoking a cursor shape service that changes the shape of the cursor based at least in part on the customizable tag-based document," as recited in claim 16, as amended.

As shown above, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest the currently claimed features of "the customizable tag-based document." It is therefore axiomatic that the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest "requesting the service to change a cursor shape ... based at least in part on the customizable tag-based document." Thus, claim 16 is allowable over the combination of the cited references on this additional basis.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Zintel, Saint and Fedotov does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 16.

Dependent Claims 17-18 and 20

Claims 17-18 and 20 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17-18 and 20 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 17-18 and 20.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/ Edward John Fain,#60960 / Dated: 1/5/2011

E. John Fain
(johnf@leehayes.com; 509-944-4756)
Registration No. 60960

David A. Divine
(Daved@leehayes.com; 509-944-4733)
Registration No. 51275